Case 8:17-mj-02534-TJS Document 21 Filed 10/16/17 Page 1 of 86

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND SOUTHERN DIVISION

- - - - - - - - x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

•

v. : Criminal No. 17-2534-TJS

:

LEE ELBAZ,

:

Defendant.

---- x September 20, 2017

Greenbelt, Maryland

DETENTION HEARING

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN, Magistrate Judge

APPEARANCES: ANKUSH KHARDORI, Esq.

1400 New York Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20005

On Behalf of the Government

NICOLAS A. MITCHELL, Esq.
Office of the U.S. Attorney

6500 Cherrywood Lane, Suite 200

Greenbelt, MD 20770

On Behalf of the Government

JONATHAN LOPEZ, Esq.

Orrick, Herrington and Sutcliffe, LLP

1152 15th St. NW Washington, DC 20005

On Behalf of the Defendant

Audio Operator: Brandon Mottley

Transcription Company: CompuScribe

5100 Forbes Boulevard

Suite 101

Lanham, MD 20706 (301) 577-5882

Proceeding recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

\underline{I} \underline{N} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{X}

2

	<u>Page</u>
Preliminary Matters	3
Qualification of Defendant	4
Comments by Ankush Khardori, Esq. On Behalf of the Government	19
Comments by Jonathan Lopez, Esq. On Behalf of the Defendant	25
Rebuttal by Ankush Khardori, Esq.	54
Comments by Beverly McCabe, Pretrial Services	61
Comments by Third-Party Custodian Lemore Elbaz	62
Ruling by Magistrate Judge Timothy J. Sullivan	66

```
lcj
  1
                           PROCEEDINGS
  2
           (Whereupon, at 9:06 a.m., the proceeding began.)
                THE CLERK: The Honorable Timothy J. Sullivan
  3
  4
      presiding.
  5
                THE COURT: Good morning, everybody. Have a seat.
      Government, call the case, please.
  6
  7
                MR. KHARDORI: United States of America versus Lee
      Elbaz. Criminal Case No. TJS-17-2534.
  8
  9
                THE COURT: Thank you. And you are --
 10
                MR. KHARDORI: Ankush Khardori on behalf of the
 11
      Government, along with Nick Mitchell.
 12
                THE COURT: All right, thank you.
 13
                MR. MITCHELL: Good morning, Your Honor.
 14
                THE COURT: Good morning.
 15
                MR. LOPEZ: Good morning, Your Honor. Jonathan
 16
      Lopez from Orrick Herrington on behalf of my client, Lee
 17
      Elbaz, who is present.
 18
                THE COURT: Mr. Lopez, have you entered your
 19
      appearance with the Court electronically?
 20
                MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, I have not. I have an
 21
      appearance form.
 22
                THE COURT: Okay, you have a hard copy?
 23
                MR. LOPEZ: I do have a hard copy, I just don't
 24
      remember my bar number.
```

THE COURT: All right. Well, why don't you pass

25

```
lcj
      your hard copy up to the courtroom deputy. We will make sure
  1
      that it gets docketed.
                MR. LOPEZ: May I approach, Your Honor?
  3
  4
                THE COURT: Sure, absolutely.
  5
           (Pause)
                THE COURT: Ma'am, you are Lee Elbaz?
  6
  7
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
  8
                THE COURT: Please stand and pull that microphone in
  9
      front of you. And please raise your right hand.
  10
           (Whereupon, the Defendant was sworn.)
  11
                THE COURT: You may put your hand down? Ma'am, what
  12
      is your full name?
  13
                THE DEFENDANT: Lee Elbaz.
  14
                THE COURT: And how old are you?
  15
                THE DEFENDANT: 36 and a week.
  16
                THE COURT: 30 --
  17
                THE DEFENDANT: 36 and a week.
                THE COURT: 36. So you are 35 now.
  18
  19
                THE DEFENDANT: No.
  20
                MR. LOPEZ: Her birthday was a week ago. She is 36
  21
      and a 1 week.
  22
                THE COURT: Okay, 36 and a week. Okay, so you are
  23
      36. How far did you go in school?
  24
                THE DEFENDANT: I start my academic degree and
  25
      unfortunately I don't have the money to finish it. So I miss
```

```
5
lcj
  1
      three courses.
  2
                THE COURT: Okay. Do you read, write and understand
  3
      English?
  4
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
  5
                THE COURT: Is English your native language?
  6
                THE DEFENDANT:
                               No, sir.
  7
                THE COURT: Here and in the Eastern District of New
  8
      York yesterday, did you have any trouble understanding the
  9
      court proceedings in English?
  10
                               No, I have somebody who was from the
                THE DEFENDANT:
  11
      courts to explain to me. But I understand 99.9 of the things.
  12
                THE COURT: And that is my question. Do you need a
  13
      Hebrew interpreter here today to help you understand what is
  14
      going on?
  15
                THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. No, sir.
  16
                THE COURT: No? All right. Are you a United States
  17
      citizen?
  18
                THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
  19
                THE COURT: What is your country of origin?
  20
                THE DEFENDANT:
                                Israel.
  21
                THE COURT: Because of your nationality, the
  22
      Government -- as a non-U.S. citizen who has been arrested or
  23
      detained, you may request that the Government notify your
  24
      country's consulate officers here in the United States of your
  25
      situation. You may also communicate with your consulate
```

```
officer. A consulate officer may be able to help you obtain
1
    legal representation and may contact your family and visit you
3
    in detention, among other things.
4
              If you want the Government to notify your consulate
    officers of Israel, you can request this notification now or
5
    any time in the future. Do you want the Government to notify
6
7
    your consulate officer at this time or do you defer?
8
              THE DEFENDANT: Defer.
9
              THE COURT: Ma'am, are you under the influence of
10
    any drugs, alcohol or medication that would in any way
11
    interfere with your ability to understand these proceedings?
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Can you repeat, please?
13
              THE COURT: Are you under the influence of any
14
    drugs, alcohol or medication that would in any way interfere
15
    with your ability to understand these proceedings?
16
              THE DEFENDANT:
                             No, sir.
17
              THE COURT: Are you under the active care of a
    medical doctor or mental health professional for any reason?
18
19
              THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. Have you received a copy of the
21
    criminal complaint that has been filed and the affidavit in
22
    support of the criminal complaint that has been filed?
23
              THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes, sir.
24
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. You can have a seat.
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, sir.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Ma'am, my name is Tim Sullivan. one of the Magistrate Judges here. You are now in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. This is the jurisdiction that the criminal charge against you has been filed. A lot of what we are doing today you went through yesterday at your initial appearance on your Rule 5 out in the Eastern District of New York but we are going to repeat that today.

The purpose of this proceeding is to advise you of the nature of the charges against you, to talk to you about important constitutional rights that you have, and to talk about your release status; that is, whether you stay in the custody of the United States marshal, pending the completion of this case, or whether you can be returned to the community under conditions and/or a combination of conditions of release.

Ma'am, in the criminal complaint, as you know, you are charged with wire fraud in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 1343, as well as conspiracy to commit wire fraud in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 1349. And Government, the maximum possible penalty?

MR. KHARDORI: 20 years and a \$250,000 fine.

THE COURT: Per count.

MR. KHARDORI: That is correct.

```
1
              THE COURT: And $100 special assessment and the
2
    possibility of forfeiture.
              MR. KHARDORI: Yes, Your Honor.
3
4
              THE COURT: Ma'am, do you understand generally the
    nature of these two charges as well as the maximum possible
5
6
    penalties, knowing that there is no parole in the federal
7
    system?
8
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
9
              THE COURT: You can have a seat. You don't have to
10
    stand up anymore. Thank you.
11
              Ma'am, you have important constitutional rights as a
12
    criminal defendant. The first is your 5th Amendment right to
13
    remain silent. Nobody can force, make or coerce you to say
14
    anything. Anything you say may be used against you. Do you
15
    understand your 5th Amendment right to remain silent?
16
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
17
              THE COURT: Ma'am, you also have the very important
18
    6th Amendment right to be represented by an attorney at every
19
    stage of these proceedings. You have counsel here today.
20
    They are your retained counsel, your counsel of choice.
21
              I am advising you that if at any point you find
22
    yourself without an attorney, you can ask the Court to
23
    consider the appointment of counsel for you if you financially
24
    qualify. Do you understand that?
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
```

1 THE COURT: Government, on release?

2 MR. KHARDORI: Your Honor, the Government is seeking

3 detention. We are prepared to argue.

THE COURT: Okay. What are your reasons for detention? I mean, I don't need to hear the whole presentation now but danger, flight --

MR. KHARDORI: Flight. Flight is the principle issue here. The Defendant obviously is an Israeli citizen. She has very, very limited contacts with the US.

THE COURT: Counsel, any preliminary comments on anything? Are you ready to go forward with the detention hearing or do you want to set it in at a later date?

MR. LOPEZ: No, I would like to move forward today, Your Honor. And if I may be heard, this is a perfect time if you would like to hear my thoughts.

THE COURT: Let me, let me -- I don't need to, not right this second. Look, I have read the Eastern District of New York pretrial services report, and quite frankly, I want another one done by our pretrial services officers.

I want it to supplement it. There are too many holes and gaps. I mean, I give her credit for being here today but I have a lot of issues with the report and I am not satisfied with her report as it was done in the Eastern District, and I am going to continue this for a little bit this morning to allow your client, if you choose.

If you choose that she doesn't want to be interviewed, that is fine too but I want a supplemental report prepared by our pretrial services office to bolster and give me some more information about this -- about your client.

So that is what we are going to do and then we will move forward with a hearing later on today, all right, whenever pretrial is ready.

Ma'am, I am going to continue this. I don't know enough about you except to know that you are not a United States citizen and, from what I see, you know two people in the United States of America. One in San Francisco and one in New York.

So I think the Government is totally right to consider you to be a flight risk. My question in my mind is whether I detain you right not to be interviewed or whether I trust you enough to stay in this building with your attorney and to be interviewed by pretrial services and then come back when we have a hearing.

Let me ask -- Ms. McCabe, how long will it take you to do a supplemental report, do you think, given the schedule today?

MS. McCABE: Your Honor, I believe from start to finish, with the verifications, about approximately an hour.

THE COURT: Okay, that sounds fine. I am going to let you -- I am not going to you detain you or anything right

now but here is what I am ordering.

You are to leave this courtroom and go directly with the pretrial services officers and your counsel to their office downstairs. You can talk to your lawyer in private about whether or not you want to provide any information or not. You are not required to.

If you choose not to, you don't have to have to do that, and I will just rely on what you told the pretrial services office in the Eastern District of New York.

We will regroup at -- let's just say 10:30 a.m. We will reschedule this for 10:30 a.m. and we will have a detention hearing at 10:30 a.m.

Ma'am, I don't know what the Magistrate Judge told you in New York but let me tell you that all federal courts throughout the country -- Eastern District of New York,

District of Maryland -- we all have to file the Bail Reform Act.

Under the Bail Reform Act, a Magistrate Judge such as myself has to look at two things: Are you a danger to the community and in my view, counsel, I don't know if you have ever appeared in front of me before, economic danger to the community is a real big deal to me.

So, you know, that is a factor. And the other factor is risk of flight, whether or not there is a serious risk that you will not appear as required, or whether you will

disappear.

For example, try to get back to Israel, for example, or to some other country -- Czech Republic or wherever else you have traveled to.

And then I have to listen to the parties' arguments and use the factors in the Bail Reform Act to make a determination as to whether detention is appropriate. That is, you will stay in custody of the United States marshal.

Or whether or not conditions and/or a combination of release conditions are appropriate that would allow you to remain in the community pending the resolution of the case.

We are going to have that hearing at 10:30 a.m., but as I said, I think that I would like a more complete picture than what I have about you, and that is why I am going to ask pretrial to do a supplement to the report, and we will get together at 10:30 a.m., and we will figure this all out.

But make no mistake, I am instructing you and ordering you not to leave this building. You are not to leave this building, and I have said this a million times to people, and they leave the building. Do not leave the building for any reason. Do not leave the building. And we will see you back at 10:30 a.m. All right, anything else?

MR. KHARDORI: Your Honor, the parties have conferred and respectfully request that an arraignment be held at 10:30 a.m. as well.

```
1
              THE COURT: Sure, that is fine, too. If that is
2
    amenable to everybody, we can do that as well. All right,
3
    thank you. See you at 10:30 a.m.
4
              THE CLERK: All rise. The Honorable Court stands in
5
    recess.
6
         (Whereupon, 9:12 a.m., the case was set aside and at
7
    11:17 a.m. the case was recalled.)
8
              THE CLERK: The Honorable Timothy J. Sullivan
9
    presiding.
10
              THE COURT: Good morning. Government, call the
11
    case. Have a seat, please.
12
              MR. KHARDORI: United States of America versus Lee
13
    Elbaz, Criminal Case No. TJS-17-2534. Ankush Khardori on
14
    behalf of the Government along with Nick Mitchell.
15
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lopez, good morning.
16
              MR. LOPEZ: Good morning.
17
              THE COURT: All right, so just as a preliminary
18
    matter, before we left, everybody said they wanted to have an
19
    arraignment, but then when I went back, it dawned on me that I
    don't have any information that there is an indictment.
20
21
              So I have a criminal complaint. So I am not sure
22
    exactly -- I am unaware, in my 30 years, I am unaware of any
23
    arraignment that goes with a criminal complaint so unless the
24
    Government has got an indictment that hasn't been presented to
25
    the Court yet, or they plan on getting it today at some point,
```

Case 8:17-mj-02534-TJS Document 21 Filed 10/16/17 Page 14 of 86 lcj 1 I don't think we can move forward with the arraignment. 2 The only thing we can do is set in a preliminary hearing date depending on what happens. 3 4 MR. KHARDORI: Your Honor is absolutely correct. 5 Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: So I have asked pretrial in our district 6 7 to do a supplemental report, and they are here in the 8 courtroom as well. And both parties had an opportunity to 9 review the pretrial services report. 10 And other than the conclusion and recommendation, 11 are there any material objections or corrections that either 12 side wishes to make to the supplemental pretrial services 13 report? Government? 14 MR. KHARDORI: The Government has reviewed it. 15 have no objections or corrections. 16 THE COURT: Mr. Lopez? 17 MR. LOPEZ: Yes, Your Honor. I was talking with 18 Mr. -- I was trying to reach him after we walked out. One 19 part that we didn't quite cover were her ties within the US. 20 She has an aunt, which we know about. She has the 21 friend, --- , which we know about, but there was another

friend that she is very close with, that she gave to the arresting officer his name and number she was supposed to spend with him that night. That is one piece of information that wasn't available.

22

23

24

25

Case 8:17-mj-02534-TJS Document 21 Filed 10/16/17 Page 15 of 86 lcj 1 A very, very close friend of hers for over 10 years who is also willing to post bond, a significant amount of 3 bond. 4 He is married, he is a green card holder. If this is not the perfect time for this, that is fine. He lives in 5 New York. 6 7 THE COURT: So basically you are telling me that 8 there are other people who can be included in the report who 9 could either provide financial assistance or a place for her 10 to stay or whatever, and you are going to raise that in your 11 argument but it is not in the report. 12 MR. LOPEZ: It is slightly more than that in that it 13 is not just people willing to put money up. She has more ties 14 to the United States. 15 THE COURT: You are saying they need to be put in 16 this report? 17 MR. LOPEZ: Well --18 THE COURT: I will put them in. Who are they? 19 MR. LOPEZ: Sure. The one is in New York. Amnon, 20 A-m-n-o-n, T-u-a-f. 21 THE COURT: T-u-a-s? 22 MR. LOPEZ: F as in Frank.

- 23 THE COURT: Okay.
- 24 MR. LOPEZ: A close friend of hers since 2008.
- 25 was going to be staying with him the first night here.

```
lcj
  1
                THE COURT: Okay.
  2
                MR. LOPEZ: How much more information would you like
      on him for the purposes of --
  3
  4
                THE COURT: That is all I need right now. Who else?
                MR. LOPEZ: And then the second one was Meital,
  5
     M-e-i-t-a-l.
  6
  7
                THE COURT: I am sorry. M --
  8
                MR. LOPEZ: M, e as in echo, i, t as in Tom, a, l as
  9
      in Lima. Levari. L-e, v as in victor, a-r-i.
 10
                THE COURT: Okay, and who is this person?
 11
                MR. LOPEZ: Also a very close friend who also lives
 12
      in New York.
 13
                THE COURT: Okay, so we will make sure that they get
 14
      included in the report. So other than that, both parties have
 15
      reviewed the pretrial services report. Let's talk, before we
 16
      begin --
 17
                MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, sorry. Apologies. One more
 18
      objection -- a couple more objections. Forgive me, Your
 19
      Honor, if you think this is more appropriate at a different
 20
             I would just like to add color to the discrepant
 21
      financial information comment.
 22
                Apparently there is a discrepancy between what she
 23
      said her assets were and what her aunt, who lives here,
 24
      believes them to be in Israel. That is the discrepancy. It
```

is not her own discrepancy.

```
1
              THE COURT: All right, that -- go ahead. That
2
    doesn't move the needle in any direction. What is your next?
3
              MR. LOPEZ: The next one is with respect to the
4
    active ICE detainer, I would object to that.
5
              THE COURT: I was just getting ready to talk about
    that so go ahead. So you object to that.
6
7
              MR. LOPEZ: Yes, I object to that. It is an
8
    unsigned detainer. It is an unsigned form that has never been
9
    served on her. Six days ago, unsigned, not acted upon.
10
    one second. I actually have an immigration attorney here to
11
    speak to that if it were to become an issue as to what the
12
    operation might be.
13
              But my understanding is that the proceedings as a
14
    whole will continue, not just today but the prosecution,
15
    without ICE interfering until this matter is resolved. That
16
    ICE detainer, as I said, I would take objection to the fact
17
    that is being active.
18
              THE COURT: As being what?
19
              MR. LOPEZ: An active ICE detainer. It is described
20
    as an active ICE detainer. I would say it is a form that is
21
    unsigned.
22
              THE COURT: All right, so let me ask the Government
23
    about that. Before I do that, any other issues with the
24
    report?
25
             MR. LOPEZ: I raised this with pretrial but they
```

```
said it was the same difference but possession of a valid foreign passport, CBP has her passport. She doesn't --
```

THE COURT: Okay, I understand. Okay. Anything

4 else?

MR. LOPEZ: No, that is all I have.

THE COURT: Okay. So Government, help me understand what the significance of anything is to this unsigned ICE detainer and Mr. Mitchell, I hope he gave you a heads up.

I think these ICE detainers are like nonsense, and I think they are prophylactic, and, you know, I have warned other assistant US attorneys that there is a case from the District of North Dakota where a Magistrate Judge does an exhaustive review of ICE detainers and how ICE detainers interplay with the Bail Reform Act.

And whether or not it is appropriate to just automatically say ICE detainer, and then, oh, everything has got to stop, and we don't make further inquiries as to whether a Defendant, subject to release conditions or a combination to release conditions because, oh, ICE detainer.

And I am trying to figure out -- again, I am not an immigration Judge. I don't know anything about immigration but my understanding is that this Defendant came into the United States lawfully. Name on a manifest, flew from Israel to New York City, comes into the country lawfully, has a passport, gets arrested on my arrest warrant, and suddenly

this person who comes into the United States lawfully should be detained because there is an ICE detainer.

So why are you presenting or what is the argument that you are presenting to the Court, this unsigned ICE detainer that -- and what is the relevance to anything that you are going to argue today, if anything?

MR. KHARDORI: It is not relevant, Your Honor. We fully agree -- Mr. Mitchell also did give me a heads-up but I think you are right on all scores.

THE COURT: Okay. So there you go, you won your ICE detainer issue. So let's talk about risk of flight.

Government?

MR. KHARDORI: Your Honor, I recognize I was in front of you a couple hours ago and I was remiss, and I apologize, that I referred to the flight risk, and that is a serious issue here but I think you flagged a more, perhaps the more pertinent one, which is the danger to the community, the economic danger.

This is a serious economic crime involving a lot of victims. To date 33 complainants to the FBI alleging losses of a million dollars. And there is a serious risk that, that kind of harm could be ongoing.

Now I recognize that it is the defense's position that the Defendant disassociated with the company a couple of months ago. The information that pretrial received was a

```
little difficult for me to decipher because it says at one point she was on medical leave, at one point she is unemployed as of now, but also that she received a paycheck as recently as apparently last week.
```

So we have serious concerns given the conduct that is at issue here that there could be further losses to the community, not just Americans. This has been a worldwide problem. So that is the economic --

THE COURT: As we stand here today, what is

the -- and again nothing is in concrete but the estimated

fraud loss that the government could prove at this juncture

based on this criminal complaint? Do you have an estimate as

to what the Government would argue to a District Court Judge

as to what the fraud losses --

MR. KHARDORI: At this time, about \$1.1 to \$1.2 million.

THE COURT: All right, go ahead.

MR. KHARDORI: We expect that number to go up as additional victims are identified. The second issue we have is the quite serious risk of flight. Now I understand the Defendant has some friends here and an aunt here but she is an Israeli citizen, she has the preponderance of her ties, familial and otherwise personal, appear to be in Israel.

Her ties to Israel themselves seem a little, not entirely firm and permanent, meaning that we can't even be

assured that if she were to go back to Israel that we would be able to find her because she may end up somewhere else entirely after that.

So we have a very serious concern about the risk of flight, and we don't think that concern is sufficiently ameliorated by the proposed bond package, which itself is apparently a moving target and without any real documentation or evidence to support it. So those are our two principle concerns.

THE COURT: So why can't -- to alleviate the flight risk, why can't lots of financial charity be posted and have her living at a certain address, perhaps under electronic monitoring. Why isn't that appropriate to address the Government's concerns about both economic danger to the community and risk of flight?

Why are we jumping right to detention at the first resort here?

MR. KHARDORI: Well, as you know, our burden on the flight risk is preponderance standard, and what we know now, right, is a proffer I suppose, of about a half million dollars in equity in a home that the Defendant's aunt has in California.

We don't know anything about whether there are any other encumbrances on that property, liens, mortgages. That is not enough assurance, in the Government's view, to compel

her.

The other issue with respect to -- to compel her to be appearing here, and --

THE COURT: Yes, by the way, what do you think about that, that this Magistrate Judge in the Eastern District of New York, what weight should I give that?

He or she told this Defendant to be down here at 9:00 a.m. this morning, and shock of all shocks, she was here at 9:00 p.m. this morning.

So you would think that if she wanted to -- she saw the handwriting on the wall and she had a copy of these charging documents, she would not have shown up in Court voluntarily this morning for these proceedings so doesn't that at least have some consideration that by her actions, she has proven that she will come to Court as directed because she got some mysterious -- I can't even read it, by the way.

It is like -- the copy I have is not really good. You have got to turn it sideways and hold it up against a solar eclipse or something to try to figure out what exactly it is but the Judge up there put a \$1.2 million bond in effect, so has that been perfected? Do you know?

MR. KHARDORI: No, we have no knowledge about whether that has been perfected. And with respect to that Judge having made a determination, it is my understanding effectively that he was -- at least the Government advocated

that it be put on here so that you could make that determination. This is the District Court where she is being charged now.

With respect to her showing up this morning, now the hearing in New York ended I think at about 4:00 p.m. yesterday afternoon, so we are talking about 18 hours in between. That is not a lot of time to get another passport and get out of the country.

So I think it tells us a little bit but not much at all really about whether the Defendant would appear for all further proceedings. It only takes one time to not show up to derail these proceedings. And, you know, being here for this appearance is not nearly dispositive an argument and doesn't tell us much.

With respect to the GPS monitoring, now the GPS monitoring is not monitoring in real time. So it is useful. If someone is in the US and you think they are going to be in the US and they don't show up, the Government can go out and find them, right?

There are plenty of cases where people have cut those bracelets off and the Government loses them. And it is extremely -- virtually useless when you are talking about someone who, where the risk of flight is abroad because you are not going to find out that they are gone until someone checks, and lo and behold they are gone. You can't just go

and round them up.

So I don't think the GPS monitoring, under the facts of this case, really help us out much at all.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. So counsel, so I can be an equal opportunity annoyance to both of you, why in the world am I going to give conditions of release to this Israeli citizen who may have a couple good friends and an aunt, on her best day.

Who has absolutely not only, you know, micro ties to the community here in the District of Maryland, which are none, but her ties to the United States, writ large, are tenuous at best and given what you have read now in the affidavit, which I am the one who issued the arrest warrant so you know, I feel fully up to date on what the allegations are in this case.

What is your argument to me that, one, your client is not an economic danger to the community based on the fraud loss and the scheme that has been alleged by the Government.

And of course a Grand Jury hasn't found probable cause yet but as we all know, it is not, despite what the forefathers anticipated, not very hard for the Government to get indictments in any federal district.

But tell me what your plan is for risk of flight because this is one of these weird cases where she thought she was coming in to go to some birthday gathering and she got

arrested, so she wasn't anticipating this. Probably wouldn't have come here if she knew she was under investigation.

And what conditions or combination of conditions of release are you going to suggest that would reasonably assure that she doesn't flee, she doesn't try to get out of the United States, and go back to Israel or wherever.

I think risk of flight is a real, real concern here and I would be interested to hear what your position is on conditions and/or combination of release conditions.

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, Your Honor. The prosecutor made a statement about what we know. Let me tell you what we know and why risk of flight is going to be mitigated and why there are reasonable conditions to assure, a combination of conditions, to assure her appearance as required.

What we know is that this is a nonpresumption case. We know that it followed a process in EDNY. It first went to pretrial services there, and I understand it went here as well, who exercised the professional and reasoned judgment. They have experience in these things. They have looked at this case.

And they have recommended pretrial release with conditions. They thought the conditions could make sense to assure her appearance.

THE COURT: Okay, but let me ask you this. Again, you seem to be very competent but you know and I know that

24

25

```
Rule 5s out don't often get the attention that they are
1
    supposed to get because all we are doing is -- we are just a
3
    pass-through for the jurisdiction that has the case.
4
              So when a Rule 5 comes to me, you know, my job is to
    make sure it is the right person, give them their initial
5
    appearance and then push them down the road and let some other
6
7
    district, Magistrate Judge, worry about the merits of it.
8
              So I am more concerned. My pretrial services office
9
    says detention.
10
              MR. LOPEZ: I am aware of that but let me just take
11
    a step back. And I appreciate everything Your Honor just
12
    said, and I am not going to try to say they did it so you
13
    should.
             That is not my argument at all.
14
              My argument is, they did it. Just the fact that
15
    they did it, not just pretrial services, the Mag Court spent a
16
    number -- close to two hours with us hearing all kinds of
17
    arguments.
18
              THE COURT: Were you up there?
19
              MR. LOPEZ: I was there, yes. I was the lawyer.
20
              THE COURT: Okay.
21
              MR. LOPEZ: Neither of these two were.
22
              THE COURT: I know.
23
```

MR. LOPEZ: And again I am not saying she did it so you should. What I am saying is, she did it. And the reason why that is important is that, as the Bail Reform Act, as this

24

25

```
Court knows, she should, she walks in here today with the
1
    presumption, her presumption, that she walks out of here with
3
    not a bond, not a signatory of anything.
4
              Then she comes back. When it is determined that she
    is a risk of flight, then the next step is what are the least
5
    restrictive conditions possible? Not one more condition than
6
7
    what is the least restrictive to reasonably assure her
8
    appearance at trial.
9
              Those conditions were set. They made sense
10
    yesterday --
11
              THE COURT: So where is the $1.2 million? Where is
12
    that? Has that been posted somewhere?
13
              MR. LOPEZ: Yes, so she -- they --
14
              THE COURT: Yes or no.
15
              MR. LOPEZ: Yes but not secured.
16
              THE COURT: So what does that mean? An unsecured --
17
    oh, I promise to pay $1.2 million but in order to do that I am
18
    not posting any property. I got no skin in the game and if I
19
    win the Powerball, then I will be able to pay the $1.2
20
    million. But otherwise I promise to pay.
21
              MR. LOPEZ: No, no, no. I am sorry. I didn't get
22
    to finish. It wasn't secured yet so she has one week of the
23
    date of yesterday to go to California and secure that
```

property. I actually have a printed out, much clearer version

that I typed up of the conditions that were set. I am happy

```
28
lcj
  1
      to give them to the Court.
  2
                THE COURT: I am all right with what I have got
  3
      here.
  4
                MR. LOPEZ: But it is a $1.2 million bond that is
      secured by $520,000 in equity, so it is a partially secured
  5
  6
      bond that she has in a house that she owns. She can prove she
  7
      owns it.
  8
                THE COURT: Who is she?
  9
                MR. LOPEZ: I am sorry. Her aunt, Lemore Elbaz, is
  10
      standing right here.
  11
                THE COURT: Good afternoon.
  12
                MR. LOPEZ: Lemore is a U.S. citizen. She has
  13
      her own company. She has -- that she started -- a tech
  14
      start-up company. She was able to buy this house from profits
  15
      from sales of stock from a previous company she had started.
  16
                She has a daughter who is 6 years old, whom she
  17
      shares custody with. That she has a three-bedroom house and
  18
      extra room for her. She has built a life here. That is,
  19
      Lemore.
  20
                She is extremely close to Lee. This is not a
  21
      situation where some distant aunt I have out in California.
  22
      Lemore babysat Lee, she tutored Lee. She was in Israel a
  23
      month ago visiting Lee. These two talk weekly. They are best
  24
      friends.
  25
                She took her on her first trip abroad when she was
```

16. This pretrial services report discusses frequent foreign travel. I have frequent foreign travel. Everyone does. If you visit and you vacation and you are a normal person who has an average amount of means, your family takes you on vacation.

She got taken to Cypress. She got taken to Paris. She traveled abroad after she left the army as people do.

I really would like an opportunity to discuss with you her personal characteristics because that is the most weighted factor of the three. The nature and seriousness of the offense is the least weighted factor of the three. And I do have cases I can proffer to the Court --

THE COURT: From the Fourth Circuit? I am not interested in any Second Circuit cases. I am not interested in some other Circuit's interpretation of the Bail Reform Act.

If you have Fourth Circuit cases that tell me how I should weigh the factors under 3142, that I haven't been doing my job right for like 5 years because if there are certain factors that are weighted and some that are less weighted, nobody -- I missed that class and nobody has told me about that.

But if you have authority from the Fourth Circuit that tells me personal characteristics is the most weighted factor and that all the other factors, nature and circumstances of the offense, blah, blah, blah -- are less weighted on some kind of scale, and that is from like a

```
1
    published opinion from the Fourth Circuit in Richmond, I am
    really interested to hear it.
              If you are going to tell me that it is something
3
4
    from Pearl Street in the Second Circuit in Brooklyn, I am not
    really moved by that, but whatever you got.
5
              MR. LOPEZ: I won't tell you it is from Brooklyn but
6
7
    are you moved by any other district or is it just Brooklyn
8
    that you don't like?
9
              THE COURT: I am just asking do you have Fourth
10
    Circuit -- I mean, you can tell me what they are and I will
11
    probably go look at them.
12
              MR. LOPEZ: On that particular point --
13
              THE COURT: Because I don't think it is interesting
14
    but I am asking you, do you have -- we are now in the Fourth
15
    Circuit, and I am asking you --
16
              MR. LOPEZ: I don't, Your Honor. I don't have
17
    controlling law for this circuit at my fingertips for you on
18
    the weight issue. Setting that aside --
19
              THE COURT: Weight of the factors issue.
20
              MR. LOPEZ:
                          That is right. The weight of the
21
    factors, which one to weigh more than the other. Let me --
22
              THE COURT: Just as an aside -- and sorry about
23
           They should have warned you that I am annoying.
    this.
24
    is the case from the Second Circuit that you were going to
```

give me that has these -- the weighing factors?

24

25

```
1
              MR. LOPEZ: I am not sure why you think that it is
2
    the Second Circuit. I am not sure that it is, Your Honor.
3
              THE COURT: Well, maybe it would be like the ninth
4
    or something like that.
              MR. LOPEZ: It is probably one of those. Frankly my
5
    notes are -- I should never admit this. My notes are a mess.
6
7
              THE COURT: Well, we can come back to it later. Go
8
    ahead.
9
              MR. LOPEZ: Let me just kind of start from the top.
10
    The one case I do want to cite here that I believe is from the
11
    Second Circuit, so not controlling, it is Kashagi*. It is the
12
    Ninth Circuit. It is Motomedi. I will give it to you. 767
13
    F2d 1403.
14
              And the reason why I am citing this case is because
15
    it stands for the proposition that doubts regarding the
16
    propriety of release should be resolved in favor of the
17
    Defendant. That is why I am citing that.
18
              THE COURT: She is presumed innocent. The Bail
19
    Reform Act says she is presumed innocent.
20
21
22
```

MR. LOPEZ: A little bit more than that though. So now we have two people, two professionals in New York, setting aside whether it is a 5.1 or not, the Magistrate spent a lot of time on this and came out with a decision that release was appropriate with a bond that she said, and I don't have a transcript, there wasn't time, but that was an awful lot of

money that put the aunt at a great deal of financial risk.

It says a lot about the faith of the aunt. This is a very serious amount of money. Almost all the equity she has in her home.

So this was a very considered opinion, and when it comes down to pretrial detention here makes a different recommendation, I understand that. But now we have two different people coming to a different conclusion based on the set of facts here. And that is a doubt, and that doubt goes in Lee's favor.

You mentioned that she -- the Government wants to say that there was 18 hours of time. 18 hours of time. She was in New York. There cannot be a better city in all of the United States to escape. She doesn't need to go get a passport. We all know that -- and I practiced in Miami before I came up to D.C. -- that not having a passport, it is nice. It is good to say, no more passport but that is not what prevents people from escaping.

If she wanted to escape, you can't tell me she couldn't have slipped off that subway, got lost in a sea of people and found her way out of here. And even if she wasn't successful she could have tried. She didn't. She came down to Maryland with her aunt, who was released in her custody.

Your Honor, I didn't go with her. I got on a plane and flew home. I didn't escort her. No one from my firm

1 escorted her.

THE COURT: So the aunt flew from California to New York.

MR. LOPEZ: The aunt flew from California to New York and she couldn't do it on Friday when this originally -- she was arrested because there wasn't time.

So what happened was she gets arrested Thursday night. She wasn't coming in for some birthday celebration, Your Honor. It was her birthday, and she was coming to celebrate with her two good friends because that is what she chose to do on her birthday, on her 36th birthday. That is how close they are. I am going to come spend this time with you and I am going to stay with you.

She gets arrested in the middle of the night,
obviously not at all -- has no idea why. I think to this day,
although I have gone over the complaint, it doesn't really
see, you know, where the issue is. I understand what has
happened. You know, why -- what she did wrong. And the aunt
got here as we could. The hearing got continued. The first
Magistrate Judge wanted to see the surety. It got continued
until Tuesday.

The aunt, who owns her own business and can do this, left, came here to offer up to be custodian, to offer up the security she has in her house, and I explained to her, the aunt. I keep calling aunt. Her name is Lemore. I explained

to Lemore, listen, if you are going to be a custodian, this is going to be a pretty serious thing here.

This niece of yours that you love so much, that you spend, you know, that you are so close with, you are going to have to rat her out if you see her trying to leave. You are going to have to call pretrial services. You are going to have to call the marshals. If you think that she is trying to leave, you need to rat her out.

And Lemore's response, and she can tell you herself, and forgive me, Your Honor, for saying this, damn right I will. She doesn't want to lose her stuff. She doesn't want to break the law herself by aiding and abetting. This is very important to her. She is going to make sure this works, from the San Francisco point to here, if you want to talk logistics and plan.

One of the conditions the Judge set, which was my recommendation, was that the -- and the aunt has agreed,

Lemore has agreed -- was that Lemore will accompany her here for court hearings and at trial come here as well for the trial.

I also offered up, although the Court declined to take me up on it, a private, after-market GPS system designed precisely for these purposes that are accurate within six feet, update every two seconds and not only issue a 97 decibel alarm when tampered with but we can have pretrial

23

24

25

```
services -- they can be instructed and will be instructed to
1
    alert pretrial services, the marshals, the local PD.
3
              I can even have Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Mitchell can see
4
    it on his phone where she is at any given moment. Your Honor,
    let's go back to the Bail Reform Act. Can conditions --
5
6
              THE COURT: Can these things work for high school
7
    age children?
8
              MR. LOPEZ: Listen, I am struggling with my 4-year-
9
         I can't even imagine when she gets there. So Your
    old.
10
    Honor, I am jumbling around. Let me just try and stay focused
11
    here for a second.
12
              First, let me just deal with what the Court actually
13
    asked me to talk about in the first instance, which is this
14
    danger to the community concept based on the economic crime.
15
    As I said, this is not a presumption case. This is not my
16
    burden to overcome. It is theirs to establish.
17
              It is an economic crime, and those are
18
    extraordinarily serious. There is no doubt about that.
19
    we can talk about this complaint, which I know you signed.
20
    There is obviously probable cause for the complaint. We don't
21
    have detention hearings unless there is probable cause.
22
```

But when we talk about the offense itself, and we talk about the strength of that case beyond probable cause, I am going to tell you I have got some things to say about it.

And while it is not the time to litigate any kind

of, you know, merits overall, I will just talk about the face of the complaint.

The \$1.1 million alleged, Your Honor, that, under 2(b)1.1, set aside any adjustments up or down, those are all disputable, who knows? What we know for a concrete fact, they are alleging \$1.1. That is what they have.

That is a base offense level of 6. And that is an add 14, and you get to 20, and 20 is 33 to 41 months. That is a lot of time. No one looks away from 33 to 41 months. It is not a 20 year maximum, and we all know that a maximum statutory sentence really doesn't mean a whole lot.

It is rare where you get to that maximum unless the Judge, of course, wants to in his or discretion to do that.

So that is the type of sentence we are facing.

And now the danger to the community: That is not a danger to the community based on what other people may still be doing somewhere else that is ongoing. Is Lee here? She gets released, is she a danger to the community? Is she somehow going to be working at some call center out of her aunt's house dialing for dollars to try to get people to keep on this scheme? That is the question.

Not if there is ongoing fraud by somebody else. Is this woman here a danger? This woman here is no danger to the community. Risk of flight, yes. Danger, no.

Now let's talk about this woman here for a second

because I haven't had quite a chance to do that. Lee Elbaz is 36 years old. She has no criminal history. Not here obviously. Not in Israel. She is from Israel and came here to celebrate her birthday with her friends.

She comes to the US about once a year. Not every single year. If you check her passport, you will see a pattern -- every year, every other year. Visit a friend, to tour our country, been to Vegas, been to California, Santa Barbara. Visit her aunt. Her aunt used to live in New York.

Her aunt we talked a little bit about a second ago.

She is present here. Lemore Elbaz. She is a US citizen. She is a licensed lawyer. Don't hold it against her. I am picking up something against New York but she is licensed in New York.

She is not practicing as an attorney. She founded a tech company in San Francisco. She lives there in a house that she owns with her 6-year-old kid she shares custody with. Lee is a typical person. She went to high school as average women do, everyday people. She went to the army, as most people in Israel do. After she traveled abroad. She took some time off and traveled abroad.

Every single college person does that. Well, that is not true. Not here but it is more common abroad. Not in the United States. At least, I wasn't allowed to. She most recently worked at UCom*, which is the company mentioned. A

place she has worked since 2014. Was hired as a team leader there.

There is a lot of debate in the complaint, we will talk about it in a second, on what CEO means and what it doesn't mean. She left the company. She no longer works there. She quit that company at the end of June of this year due to medical issues.

And, you know, she has nothing to do with it. The prosecutor talked about how there are these discrepancies and she was getting paid and maybe even paid next week. She gets a certain amount of paid sick time out. She had a lot of sick time. She didn't take vacations so she gets paid her sick time. Her last check, I think is coming next week.

It is a little bit different picture than the one the Government wants to paint. As for family in Israel, yes. Very normal, typical family. She has a brother and a sister. We talked about contacts in Israel. Of course she has contacts in Israel. She is from Israel. That is where her family is.

She has a mom who had lung cancer. Couldn't make this particular trip to be here today. She has a dad who drives an ambulance. Has for 30 years. She is not married. She doesn't have a husband back there. She doesn't have any kids back there. She doesn't have any kids.

This is a law-abiding family. Not one of them has

ever had any brush with the law, period, full stop. This is not someone who would flee. This is someone who is going to show up as she did today unassisted by me, with the custody of her aunt, as the conditions contemplated, as were followed through.

Nothing has changed except in her favor of showing a track record. One might think these are just words I am telling you. Yes, she is going to show up, trust me. She might say, trust me. I am just going to show up.

Well, that is what we are supposed to do under the Bail Reform Act, come up with those conditions that are the least restrictive ones to reasonably assure her appearance.

Now the complaint. Let's talk about the complaint a little bit. This complaint, while not litigating the probable cause aspect to be sure, is based on two witnesses' statements, alleged former employees. The actual ownership structure is not all that clear, and that is something that we would be disputing.

We have no idea who they are. We have no idea what their credibility is. They say certain things happened. And that is in the complaint. But there is nothing more than what they are saying, and if they are former employees, show me a company that doesn't have disgruntled former employees who say something happened to me.

You also have a group of investors. 33 of them they

cite. Several they have in the complaint, who say, I didn't get my money back. They screwed me out of my money.

Okay, show me a company that doesn't have people calling up and saying, I got screwed out of my money. Each one of those cases is a mini-trial in and of itself.

The third thing they have are the e-mails. That is the actual only concrete thing here. Except the trouble is they are not conclusively on their face criminal at all. One of them says that she is going to refer people to the legal department. Okay, that is what happens when you run a call center. You refer people to the legal department when there is a dispute. You don't engage.

THE COURT: Or, to be cynical, as part of the scheme that, when people want their money back or want their money out, you set up these roadblocks that will prevent what somebody is -- perhaps an innocent investor, from taking their money back. You create roadblocks as part of your scheme, artifice and criminal activity to stop them from doing it.

MR. LOPEZ: Okay, that may entirely but true in the industry and there are probably a lot of bad apples who do that. And not only binary options but probably everywhere.

Everyone has bad apples, and maybe some industries have more bad apples than others. This apple is presumed good. I can't take that complaint and say, presumed innocent at least.

THE COURT: Are there allegations, counsel, in the complaint, and again, I was a criminal defense attorney so I stood where you are actually in this courtroom a bazillion times but is there something in the affidavit that says that she has multiple aliases? I don't remember that. Wasn't there something in there that --

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, there is, of course. Paragraphs 47 and 49 are where they deal with that.

THE COURT: Talk to me about that, and why isn't that indicia of somebody who -- forget about the guilt/innocence because that is really not my issue, and as I told you earlier, I presume her to be innocent but for the purposes of the Bail Reform Act but tell me why I shouldn't give -- and this is your word, not mine -- this weight, you like this weight context that, you know, I am not sure you want it to go down.

But why doesn't that fact that the government alleges that your client has the ability to have different aliases and to represent herself to others not under her real name but uses aliases, why isn't that something that should also give me some concern when I am contemplating whether she is a risk of flight because if she knows how to use aliases, and that kind of sets off some alarm bells for me that she is pretty sophisticated.

MR. LOPEZ: So let me talk a little bit about that.

She works in a call and retention center. It is not at all uncommon for people who deal with a high volume of calls to use different names. To not use their real name. It is also not uncommon for them to come up with some name that sounds familiar to the customer base that they might be dealing with.

When I call my cable company at my house at nighttime, and I have a pause and I get transferred to some location that I don't know that I am being transferred to a location, and someone named Jim answers who can barely speak English, is that necessarily indicative of aliases and flight?

Call centers do these types of things. They use stage names. This is not a legal to-do. In the context of this complaint, there is a reference in the complaint in paragraph 16 to an SEC alert. And the SEC alert talks about binary options, and it says that they may, that people engaging this, may be in violation of federal law. Not in violation, maybe.

And then it says, you know, they may make material misrepresentations. And that is at the bottom when they give other red flags. They don't really say that those are material. And that is the question. Is someone's name, if I am talking to them in this context, is that material? That is what the complaints lacks.

It is a material misrepresentation that you say your name is Jim when it is really something else? That is going

to be for trial, right? That is later. But on its face here, the complaint doesn't cite a duty. The complaint doesn't cite an obligation that is established between these parties.

Let's remember what this is. For a lack of a better term, this is betting. For a very lack of a better term, Binary Options, I call you up and say, look, I am going to place a \$60 bet that gold is going to be 353 cents tomorrow at 2:00 p.m.

If it is 53 cents or more, I win. If it is not, I lose. I am not so surprised about these investor complaints. People lose money here. That is what happens, and they are probably pissed about it. But at the same time, that doesn't mean that people fielding these calls using stage names are making some material misrepresentations.

Same concept with location. I mean, let's look at paragraph 17 of this. I am sorry, paragraph -- there is no question they were talking about using different locations and, you know, there are a thousand reasons why that might be so, in particular when you are talking about some place in Israel.

You don't want to advertise you are talking to someone in Israel. I am not sure that it is true or not true. What I am trying to say is that the strength here, what she is supposedly going to run away from is not as strong as the Government wants it to be.

They do a lot of things in this complaint to make it think like this is some Nigerian boiler room or some sort of lottery scam. That is none of these things. It is a legitimate business, legal type of business in Israel as well as here, and if you look at paragraph, just to point something out to you of how the complaint is drafted to kind of get you in that spot, look at nine, paragraph nine, for a moment.

It talks about a company called Spot Option, which is own related, not part of the same company as UCom. The Government doesn't dispute that. And it wants to tell you about a former employee at Spot Option. Someone who no longer even works at Spot Option. We don't know who they are.

And it says that Spot Option is based in Israel but the contact portion, --- portion of that Website shows locations in other places of the --- .

I have no idea what the relevance of that is. I have no idea who this person is, if he even knows his own company but I can tell you, you can go on any major corporation's Website and their contact us place is going to list a location or two, and they are going to have a ton of other offices.

Here in DC, almost every company has an office for government relations. They don't list those on the Website.

I am not sure where that fits in.

There is another paragraph that says, the Apple

iPhone doesn't carry these apps, which also is not true. I am not sure where that fits in. It is a leap. Maybe it fits into the broader scheme. Of course, potentially it does, but how does Apple not carrying an iPhone make her scared that she has got to get out of this country?

And I will tell you, Your Honor, it doesn't. You know, these witness statements say all kinds of things that when I read them -- I mean, I separated out each one for Lee. What are the witnesses saying about Lee? What are the e-mails saying?

The witnesses say that she brags about soothing customers. Okay, all right. The witnesses say that, you know -- that is exactly what she is supposed to do. She runs a call center. The witnesses talk about how your bonus and incentive options for making certain targets, and -- this is paragraph 51, Your Honor, and that it motivated sales staff to take whatever steps necessary to convince customers to deposit funds.

It is kind of two things imbedded here. I will deal with one of them. This is not an e-mail saying, from Lee saying, take whatever steps necessary. It is not even a statement from the witness that said, Lee told me, take whatever steps necessary.

This is an impression of what motivates people to do things. How is that possibly something that she is going to

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

run away from? That is so scary that she is going to run way?

These two witnesses, we have no idea who they are.

3 By the way, the idea of convincing a company to stick with you

4 | to deposit more, to continue business, every time -- again, I

5 actually do hate my cable company. I call my cable company, I

6 threaten to leave. They convince me why I need to stay, every

7 | single time.

This is not a Nigerian boiler room. It is not a lottery. It is a business, legitimate business, that we are talking about here.

Back to the e-mails just for a few. As I mentioned, to defuse the situation, I mentioned where she says in paragraph 59 -- I am sorry. I lost track of myself here.

It is in 58. You know, an investor is complaining, and the e-mail --- says Lenna* is watching this e-mail as well. She would like to schedule a call with you when you are available.

Someone complains. The manager here says, let me call you back. Let's talk about manager/CEO. A lot made of the CEO. We have got a couple of different things going on here. CEO in Israel may not mean the same thing here. She is the manager of this whole retention center. Sure, she supervises other people. She may even supervise other managers, I don't know.

She does not own this company. There is not one

allegation in here that she owns it. In fact, there is a statement in here contrary to that in paragraph 44 that she is not -- that she reported to the owner.

She is not an owner. It says she reported to the owner. She is not an owner of the company. She had only been there four years. She has \$20,000 of liquid assets. She is not the CEO as we think of things as the CEO. Even the complaint itself talks in paragraph 53 that she used it because it made customers feel important.

Is that material to make me feel like am talking to the head honcho when I am really not talking to head honcho?

I don't know. It doesn't sound like it to me but maybe in some --- of this case it is. I don't know.

Complaint fails to say -- they don't that next step.

They say there are aliases but they don't say why that is a

material issue. On the aliases piece, she has an e-mail

address and she signs it with her own name, Lee.

This is, you know, there can be all kinds of experts later, disputes back and forth, but the standard operating practice when you deal in high volumes, you don't want you name out there. You don't want your e-mail out there on some spam list.

There are all kinds of reason in this particular type of business to do such things. And the idea that you have got disgruntled, former alleged employees making some

statements, and you have got investors who are engaging in a risky business mad that they lost the money.

And you have got e-mails that are on their face not evidence of criminal action. They raise eyebrows, no question. I am not going to tell you they don't raise eyebrows. I am not trying to tell you this is a story that I read to my 4-year-old and there is nothing to see here.

What I am trying to tell you is that there are a lot of points of this complaint that are worth fighting, that should be fought, and that are not, given the amount of time that we are talking about -- maybe I am jaded because I have seen some big sentences where people were still potentials that were released.

It is not a situation where she is going to run at the first light. She didn't, by the way, run at the first light. There, in this district by a different Magistrate Judge, conditions on facts, economic crime, living in another area, pretrial release was also granted. I can tell that was Magistrate Judge Grimm.

I can tell you about the facts of that case if you want. Told to live in Atlanta as opposed to the district,

Maryland here. Maybe it was North Carolina. Again, I

apologize, Your Honor. I can get it actually straight if you want it.

But I am trying to say here, Your Honor, is that

from a personal characteristics of the Defendant, setting aside whatever weight should be assigned. Let's assume they are all equal, and believe me, I am not going down any road to convince you otherwise.

THE COURT: That ship has sailed.

MR. LOPEZ: And it is really frankly, to me it is not -- that is important. Facts stand for themselves. Each of these factors, on the facts, stand for themselves and all of them support pretrial release in this case.

You have got a law-abiding citizen in another country. That is pretty much what is holding her here for the Government. I didn't hear much other than that, that of substance. And being a foreign national in and of itself, is not a reason to detain with no conditions, right?

That doesn't get you to no conditions. She -- on the nature and the seriousness of the offense, of course, it is a serious offense alleged: wire fraud, victims, potential victims at this stage. None of that has been really established.

As I mentioned, each one of these investor cases is a mini-trial on their own. There are always two sides to a story. I don't know what happened here.

And then when you talk about the weight of the complaint against Lee herself as opposed to the industry. If you look at that complaint, there is a lot in there about

industry norms and in general. Generally speaking, industry insider.

What about Lee? What do we have about Lee? She had stage names. She had other people in her office who were doing stage names. Okay, I don't know that, that is material to this case and it is sure not indicative of risk of flight here today.

She has e-mails where she is telling people not to make mistakes. Some of them raise more eyebrows than others about how things are wired. I don't know what that is. It is not a sanctions case. It is not like a stripping situation.

I don't know what is happening here. These are all things that are going to be explored but they sure don't, on their face, when looked at, paint a picture of the crime of the century or that she is the mastermind of it.

In fact, I bet you the Government doesn't even believe she is the mastermind of it despite what they are saying here. I am sure there are other people they want much higher than her if there is a crime here at the end of the day.

Your Honor, she stands before you with a loving, very close relative with assets to post. To serve as custodian. She has a friend in New York who is willing to post more money. He is married to someone who is right now under consideration for a state judgeship.

1 They are willing to put that money that they have at risk as well if called upon to do so. She is not going to put 3 her aunt in jeopardy. Her aunt won't let her be put in 4 jeopardy. I can tell you more about the GPS, every two second, six foot accuracy for Mr. Mitchell and whoever else wants it. 5 I don't think Mr. Mitchell actually wants it. 6 7 THE COURT: He is shaking his head. I don't think 8 he wants it. 9 MR. LOPEZ: But detention is an extreme. And 10 according to you, you know this. Detention is the last 11 resort. I don't see how we are anywhere near the last resort. 12 If anything, as every day goes forward, she shows 13 her track record of being able to comply. The aunt is, you 14 know, Lemore and her, there is a 5:00 p.m. flight out of DCA, 15 not Dulles, DCA. The difference is important. 16 Dulles is an international airport. DCA is a 17 national airport. Nonstop to San Francisco. She will be 18 under house arrest in San Francisco with GPS, with the -- and 19 these are the conditions that were found reasonable at the 20 Magistrate Judge and pretrial services up in New York. 21 \$1.2 million secured by \$500 equity in aunt's house. 22 The aunt also has equity in another house worth \$600,000. Her 23 share is co-owned with her ex. I don't know how she secures 24 that. That is the issue.

She also has about \$100,000 in assets, and that is

how we get to \$1.2 million. And she is ready to sign on the dotted line no problem. Home incarceration, travel restricted as the two districts for court appearance, attorney visits, medical emergencies. The aunt must travel with her. Surrender passports and not reapply.

Report as directed to pretrial services. GPS monitoring and then there was another condition added of no communication with any co-Defendant or conspirator known to the Defendant, all persons involved with the companies named in the complaint or alleged unlawful activities except in the presence of counsel.

That should hopefully ameliorate any issues of ongoing fraud because if they get wind that she is doing any of this, that is a violation of her condition.

Your Honor, I end where I started. What do we know? We know a process was followed. We know folks in New York who disagree obviously with the folks down here. Exercise their own judgment. I can't speak to how fast they did it, how much time they took into consideration, how much care they made.

But nevertheless we have to trust in the process, and they did what they were supposed to do. And they came up with reasonable conditions. The Magistrate Judge went through that same exercise. Nothing has changed except those conditions are even more reasonable today due to her appearance here before Your Honor.

I ask you to apply the Bail Reform Act as I know you will. Let these conditions stand. I am not even sure -- I think there could be even less-restrictive means but these work so I am not going to push my luck in that regard, especially given the uphill battle I am facing.

Let her go to the bathroom when she wants to go to the bathroom. Let her take a shower when she wants to take a shower. Let her wear what she wants in the house. Let her get a snack when she needs to get a snack.

She is presumed innocent. She should not be detained. This is a case where they apparently have done search warrants. There are going to be lots of documents. There is going to be discovery. They have got cooperators.

I don't know when this is going to trial. Why is she being locked up during that time when she showed up here today?

18 hours. In other pretrial detentions, the first second, someone is going to flee. The first second they can, they are out of here. Apparently my next argument, I can say, well, it takes about 18 hours for someone to leave, according to the Government. She didn't.

This is not to her. This is the same as every

Defendant, so I don't mean to say this is, in fact, the very

least weighted, if any weight. It is going to be difficult

for me to prepare a defense with her, and for her to prepare a

defense with anybody incarcerated.

lcj

1

- In San Francisco she can come to Orrick's offices.
- 3 | We are based in San Francisco. Sit with a videoconference
- 4 with me, and we can do this. We can do this the right way,
- 5 the way it deserves to be done.
- This is not a simple cocaine case. You know, was
- 7 | the cocaine under the seat or was it not? This is going to
- 8 trial in a month. Your Honor, the Bail Reform Act, under its
- 9 terms, is designed to protect the Defendant, not a sword for
- 10 | the Government.
- 11 Let's follow that Bail Reform Act and impose these
- 12 conditions here, which have proven to be, well, maybe not the
- 13 | least restrictive. Restrictive conditions enough to assure
- 14 her appearance as required.
- 15 THE COURT: Okay. All right, thank you.
- 16 Government, anything else?
- MR. KHARDORI: Yes, Your Honor. I will try to be
- 18 brief.
- 19 THE COURT: Why don't you concentrate on a little
- 20 | bit about -- Mr. Lopez talked about, and I have no real
- 21 | interest in it one way or the other but why don't you talk to
- 22 | me briefly about what the Government alleges this Defendant's
- 23 roles is in this scheme to steal money from other people by
- 24 the binary option thing.
- 25 And once they start making money, they don't let you

have your money back and then they steal all your money. What is the Government's allegation as to this specific Defendant's role in this conspiracy?

MR. KHARDORI: Well, Your Honor, the defense said that CEO doesn't really mean CEO. That is, I think, actually even conceitedly itself a misrepresentation, right, because that title may very well matter to people.

So we have direct misrepresentations by this individual, not just about her title but about her name and where she was. She is managing this team of people who are also -- and then helping them set up aliases, proving aliases.

And I think there are e-mails cited in the complaint in which she is address the matter of customer withdrawals, and at a bare minimum is facilitating the creation of those, I think as you put it, those roadblocks.

All of that is fraud. All of that is fraud. Very briefly, the points that were raised about this, which I thought were disturbing diminishments of the allegations in the complaint, to put it mildly.

The use of aliases is serious. When you call your cable company and you are speaking to someone who may not give you their real name, I think that is a very different matter than maybe when you pick up the phone and call your financial advisor.

When you pick up the phone and someone is selling

you a financial product, that is very different. At the cable company, that may not be material. It is going to be material here. I bet the investors wanted to know or else they wouldn't be lying about it.

The roadblocks argument, the notion that other people do it, well, I don't think that tells us anything except this particular kind of conduct may be very unfortunately rampant.

The notion that it is betting, okay? Well, here is the difference between gambling at a casino and what we are talking about here. Nobody is lying to you about your odds at a casino, okay? Nobody is calling you up and coaxing to invest more money in a financial product that, mathematically, you are going to lose money in.

That is the fraud. It is not the existence of the casino, right? Casinos functions properly, if they are obviously licensed in the right jurisdictions, if they are not lying to the people about the kinds of money that they can make.

I do also want to just -- for the record, I was not at the detention hearing. I finished a trial yesterday so I was not able to make it but a colleague of mine who covered it, I have spoken to him extensively. We heard a lot about what happened in New York.

From my understanding, it was 100 percent clear,

despite the suggestion otherwise, that this was de novo today here. So clean slate. So all we know is what happened over the last 18 hours. And I mentioned why I think that doesn't tell us much at all.

And in fact I think we heard quite a bit about how easy it is to get away. Slipping out on the subway. And also this business about pretrial with the professionalism of the people in New York. I have no doubt about that.

I also have no doubt about the professionalism and thoroughness of the people here. So I don't think we should be suggesting that any one or the other is somehow better at this. These are difficult decisions as you well know, and people are doing the best they can, and from what I have seen and heard about what happened in New York, a much more thorough job was done here this morning than was done there.

Also finally with respect to the notion that there is no criminal history, as I am sure you well know, that is very often the case in white-collar cases, someone is going to show up with no criminal history.

So I think we have spent a lot of time during the course of that presentation litigating the merits of the complaint, which you obviously signed off on. So no probable cause. We are here. Question is, whether this person should be out. We talked about the harm, the economic harm, and the very serious risk of flight.

25

```
1
              I don't think you have enough facts or we have
    enough facts to get comfortable that she is going to be here
3
    based on this currently unsecured bond.
4
              THE COURT: So let me ask you this though. And I
    will here from pretrial in a second and I am also going to
5
6
    hear from the proposed third-party custodian. But what if I
7
    loaded up on the money and, you know, Mr. Lopez, just one
8
    word, yes or no, was it the understanding of the Magistrate
9
    Judge in the Eastern District that this would be a de novo
10
    review of her release conditions, yes or no?
11
              MR. LOPEZ: Yes. I never meant to suggest --
12
              THE COURT: What?
13
              MR. LOPEZ: Yes, I never meant to suggest otherwise.
14
    I was just showing that there were reasonable differences.
15
              THE COURT: So what if I loaded up on the financial
16
    component of this, made the third-party custodian post the
17
    property before I release the Defendant, made the Defendant
18
    post unsecured bond, and make sure that all the land records
19
    were protected and that the third-party custodian would say
20
    posted collateral up to, let's say, $2 million. And that was
21
    done before this Defendant was released from custody.
22
              Would that address some of the Government's -- put
23
    it on EM at her aunt's house in San Francisco, would that
24
    ameliorate some of the Government's concerns or no?
```

MR. KHARDORI: Some but not all. I think here is

the fundamental problem with that. I think the complaint makes very clear this is a multimillion dollar fraud. We are not talking about just the Defendant who may or may not be at the top of the totem pole here, right?

That means there are going to be other people who are going to be interested in potentially helping, and there are potentially unindicted co-conspirators.

So we are talking about sources of funds abroad that could also potentially be put to use to make someone whole if the bond package isn't falling apart.

THE COURT: But at this point in time, the evidence that you have in the complaint -- not an indictment but in the complaint -- you don't give me any information that you have linked bank accounts to her, that money has gone directly to her, that she has personally benefited from this.

You say to me that she is probably the CEO because if you are a CEO in the United States you are probably a CEO in Tel Aviv or Israel. That she has fake names when she deals with investors and she gives instructions through e-mails to the call center about how to mislead and rip off their quote, unquote clients. I get all that.

But what -- do you have any other evidence that you care to share about this Defendant's specific role in this very large conspiracy to defraud people?

MR. KHARDORI: No, I think that actually, accurately

sums up the allegations, yes.

And I think just at this particular junction, I don't think we have enough available information, even if proposed a very steep bail package, that it could be satisfied or that it would be commensurate to the very serious flight risk that we have here.

And that is really our central concern here, about that particular issue, the notion that a lot of money could be put up. Well, that is not the sole issue, right? The issue is not just a lot of money but is it commensurate with the risk? And there is an extremely serious flight risk here.

THE COURT: And what do you base that on?

MR. KHARDORI: Well, this person has the bulk of her

ties --

THE COURT: No, I know, so she doesn't have a lot of ties to the United States but she has an aunt here who is willing to post money and be third-party custodian. Willing to let her live with her. Willing to accompany her to all court appearances. So it is not like, defense is saying, well, just let me out and I promise I will come.

There are some conditions that have been presented by the defense that could reasonably assure her appearance and, you know, what information other than just the obvious, that she doesn't have -- she is not a second-generation

Washingtonian or hasn't lived in Prince George's County or the

mitigate against those.

- southern division for her entire life, what is the

 Government's argument that she -- specific, with

 particularity -- that she is a serious flight risk because now

 she has got these conditions that she is offering that would
- 6 MR. KHARDORI: Well, I don't think, much beyond, as 7 you noted, what we have already sort of gone over.

One of the things that is actually rather telling is we keep hearing -- and to my understanding this happened in New York, we were hearing a lot about friends who mysteriously never show up.

So maybe if we have one or two here but, you know, in every single appearance, my understanding is more and more friends get added to the list who don't show up.

So I understand logistically it is not easy for people to travel and things like that but a lot of this is just happening on the say-so, frankly, of the defense counsel and that is not good enough for us.

THE COURT: All right, thank you. Pretrial, any other comments other than your report, and is there any impediment with courtesy supervision in I guess would be the Northern District of California if I go that direction?

MS. McCABE: Good morning, Your Honor. Beverly
McCabe from pretrial services. We actually have not had an
opportunity to staff the case with our office there in San

```
lcj
  1
      Francisco.
                They weren't open this morning so we have, if Your
  2
      Honor is inclined to release, we would respectfully ask that
  3
  4
      we have an opportunity to ask our office there to go out and
      actually do a home inspection at the proposed third-party
  5
      custodian's residence and then also investigate any properties
  6
  7
      or moneys that are going to be posted to make sure that there
  8
      are no impediments to using that to make sure that the
  9
      complete bond can be met before the Defendant is released.
  10
                THE COURT: All right, thank you. All right,
  11
      Ms. Elbaz, is that how you pronounce your name? Come on up.
  12
      Good afternoon. Please raise your right hand.
  13
           (Whereupon, the party was sworn.)
  14
                THE COURT: You can put your hand down. What is
  15
      your full name?
  16
                MS. ELBAZ: Lemore Elbaz.
  17
                THE COURT: And where do you live?
                MS. ELBAZ: I live at 1633 Burrows Street in San
  18
  19
      Francisco.
  20
                THE COURT: And what is your occupation?
  21
                MS. ELBAZ: I am the founder and CEO of a start-up
  22
      company, a software company.
  23
                THE COURT: And you heard Mr. Lopez -- are you a
  24
      licensed attorney?
```

MS. ELBAZ: I took the bar and passed it in New

25

```
lcj
      York. I have a license in New York and Israel. I don't
  1
      practice though.
                THE COURT: But you are licensed to practice law in
  3
  4
      the state of New York?
  5
                MS. ELBAZ: Yes.
                THE COURT: And anywhere else?
  6
  7
                MS. ELBAZ: Israel.
                THE COURT: In Israel, okay. Prior to yesterday, I
  8
  9
      guess, when was the last time you saw the Defendant?
 10
                MS. ELBAZ: In August on my trip to Israel.
 11
                THE COURT: And describe for the nature of your
 12
      relationship with her.
                MS. ELBAZ: She is my first niece. She is like my
 13
 14
      daughter. I mean, she made me an aunt. So we are very close.
 15
      I babysat her as a teenager. I tutored her when she went to
 16
      school. I helped her when she went to college. She stayed
 17
      with me in Israel many, many times in my own apartment in
 18
      Israel when I used to live there.
 19
                When I moved here, she visited me and stayed with me
 20
      for a long trip when I lived in Palo Alto. She was supposed
 21
      to visit me this time. She is very, very close to me.
 22
                THE COURT: Who lives in your residence?
 23
                MS. ELBAZ: Just me and my daughter, and I have an
 24
      in-law downstairs. I sometimes Airbnb. I intend to stop
```

doing that for her to stay there given the circumstances.

25

THE COURT: So you sat here, and I saw you move from seat to seat to seat. But I know you are anxious about this but if I ask you to post \$2 million, all of the equity, everything you own on Burrows Avenue or Street, whatever it is, and any other cash assets that you have, secured by your real property and an unsecured by her, would you be willing to post everything you have to reasonably assure that she won't leave the United States to avoid facing the charges in this district?

MS. ELBAZ: So Your Honor, I am actually posting everything I have, which is worth \$1.2 million. I also have a share in my company. And I am willing to post that too.

Maybe so I explain the breakdown so you understand where it is coming from.

My house on Burrows Street is a house I own on my own, and it is worth \$1.2 million. I have a mortgage of \$600,000 on it. So it is about -- my down payment was \$420,000 but it is worth \$1.2 so we are assuming it is about \$520,000, my share in it. And I have a mortgage statement to prove my ownership of that house.

The second thing I have is in my bank account about \$110,000\$ and I am posting that too.

The third thing is a house on Eugenia Avenue, which I co-own with my ex. And as co-owner, I am allowed to post only my assets in that asset.

The house is worth about \$2 million. There is about \$650,000 mortgage on it. And I have a share of between \$600,000 and 700,000 depending on how much we will sell it for.

And the reason I didn't want to put a lien on it is

I am in a process with my ex to sell that house. So whatever

money comes out of that house, I am willing to post as a bond

for her.

I have no doubt she is not going anywhere, Your

Honor. She has never done -- she was never pulled over. This
is all one big mistake and I am sure it is going to clear out.

I wish I could say she is sophisticated enough to run such a
scheme and as her aunt I am saying painfully she is not
sophisticated enough to do that and I know that because I
taught her math.

THE COURT: So let me -- I am terrible at math and I became a Judge. So I don't what that means -- let me ask -- don't talk too much about the case. You understand though, if I make you third-party custodian you are going to have certain responsibilities to be basically the eyes and ears of the Court, and if she starts doing anything or causes you concern about not following the conditions that I set, you are going -- I don't care whether she is your niece or not -- you are going to have to have the obligation to contact pretrial services and tell them that she is not doing what they told

```
Case 8:17-mj-02534-TJS Document 21 Filed 10/16/17 Page 66 of 86
lcj
      her to do. Do you understand that?
  1
                MS. ELBAZ: Absolutely, absolutely, sir. My
  2
      daughter is here. She is 6 years old. I dragged her out of
  3
  4
      school to be here. I have no intention to put my daughter's
      life and future at risk. I have no doubt she is not going
  5
      anywhere. And I put my life on it.
  6
  7
                THE COURT: And you have no doubt -- wait a minute.
  8
      You have no doubt that I will make sure that you lose your
  9
      house and every asset that you post and forfeited to the
  10
      Government if she runs? Do you understand that?
  11
                MS. ELBAZ: Absolutely, absolutely.
  12
                THE COURT: That is a risk that you are willing to
  13
      accept?
  14
                MS. ELBAZ: Absolutely, sir. She is not going
  15
      anywhere. She is going to clear her name. I want her to be
  16
      able to visit me in the United States. She is not going
  17
      anywhere. This is all one big mistake. She should have never
  18
      been arrested.
  19
                THE COURT: Okay. All right, you can have a seat.
  20
      Thank you.
  21
                MS. ELBAZ: Thank you, sir.
  22
                THE COURT: Anything else anybody wish to say?
  23
                MR. KHARDORI: Not from the Government, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: All right. This matter is before the

Court for a detention hearing. The Government is moving for

24

25

detention on two prongs: Both that Ms. Elbaz is an economic danger to the community, given the allegations contained in the criminal complaint, and more pertinent is the Government is moving for detention under the Bail Reform Act because they believe that Ms. Elbaz is a risk of flight and a risk of nonappearance, particularly given the allegations in the complaint and her lack of ties to the United States of America.

She is not a citizen of the United States of

America. She is a citizen of Israel. Was living in Israel

and traveling to the United States when she was arrested on an

arrest warrant at International Airport in New York.

And the Government is suggesting that there are no conditions and/or combination of conditions of release that would reasonably assure her appearance in Court.

The defense argues that -- spent a lot of time talking about the merits of the complaint, which I have no interest in and, in fact, as I have said, tried to move it along in a nice way, saying that I presume her to be innocent so we didn't need to hear about that but we did.

Says that now that the aunt is willing to step up to be third-party custodian, that there are, in fact, conditions and/or a combination of conditions of release that would allow her return to the community, particularly San Francisco under the supervision of the Northern District of California

pretrial services if they accept the case as well as third party to her aunt at that Burrows Street address.

You know, this is a tough case because you can go either way. Weighted factors or nonweighted factors. I think that I would be totally justified and could write an opinion order that would be bulletproof on review by just determining on my own, which I am allowed under the Bail Reform Act, that this Defendant is a serious risk of flight.

She really has no, except for her aunt and a couple friends, she doesn't really have -- and she has no ties to this community. No ties to the District of Maryland. And even on her best day she has got an aunt and some friends, and that is hardly sufficient for me.

We all know that criminal complaints are the tip of the iceberg and we all know that, you know, sometimes the Government's cases are in progress and that we don't really know the full scope of what the alleged criminal conduct is. All we know in this case is this very tip, this very little snippet that the Government has chosen to put in the criminal complaint that I obviously signed.

I consider all the factors under the Bail Reform Act to be important and I don't think that any more of them are important than others, and I apply them across the board as fair as I can.

I am going to issue conditions of release in this

case but Ms. Elbaz is going to be detained in the custody of the marshal until all the conditions are met. And the conditions of release are as follows:

I do believe, given the circumstances and given the aunt's willingness to post money and other conditions that I am going to impose, that there are release conditions that will eventually be appropriate for her to be released but they are going to be in place before she steps out of this courtroom, and if it messes up flights and stuff like that, I am sorry but that is just the way it is going to be.

Ma'am, please listen carefully to this. I am going to pass it down to you in writing when I am done. You may not violate any federal, state or local laws while on release.

You must reside at an address approved by pretrial. You must appear in Court as required and surrender to serve any sentence imposed.

I am directing that you personally execute an unsecured bond binding you to pay to the United States of America the sum of \$1 million in the event of a failure to appear as required or surrender to serve any sentence imposed.

I am placing you under the third-party custody of your aunt, Lemore Elbaz, at the address approved by pretrial in the Northern District of California. You may not change your address, as I said, without pretrial services' approval. The third-party custodian is to supervise you in accordance

with all the conditions of release, to use every effort to reasonably assure your appearance at all scheduled court hearings and to notify the Court immediately if you violate any of these conditions or disappear.

You are under the supervision of pretrial services.

You must report on a regular basis to the supervising officer.

You shall promptly obey all reasonable directions and instructions of the supervising officer. I am directing the third-party custodian, who agreed to execute a bond in the amount of \$2 million secured by her real property and other assets.

That \$2 million will be forfeited to the United

States of America in the event that the Defendant disappears

or fails to appear in Court. A significant amount of that,

whatever the numbers work out to be, will be posted to secure

the collateral at 1633 Burrows Street, San Francisco,

California.

That an order of Court will be signed, and that this, that order, the order that I sign, has to be filed among the land records for San Francisco or that address to evidence the security interest of this Court and the Government in that residence as well as the residence -- what was the other address? The one that you own with your ex-husband? What is that?

MS. ELBAZ: It is 15 Eugenia Avenue.

```
71
lcj
  1
                THE COURT:
                            Eugenia Avenue?
  2
                MS. ELBAZ: 15, 1-5, Eugenia, E-u-g-e-n-i-a.
                THE COURT: And where is this at, San Francisco too?
  3
  4
                MS. ELBAZ: San Francisco, California, 94110.
                MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, I don't know if it is
  5
      appropriate for me to say anything but I don't know -- she
  6
  7
      doesn't actually have $2 million, I don't know that she has
  8
      securable assets in that regard.
  9
                THE COURT: She is going to post -- she has got $1.6
  10
      in assets --
  11
                MS. ELBAZ: $1.2.
  12
                THE COURT: I am just talking about net amounts.
                                                                   Ι
  13
      don't care about what your equity is in it at this point.
  14
      That you have a $1.6 million residence, a $1.2 million
  15
      residence on Burrows Street, and then you have half, roughly,
      whatever your half interest is on Eugenia. That comes out to
  16
  17
      about $2 million.
  18
                MS. ELBAZ: $600 I have in that --
  19
                THE COURT: Okay, so $1.8. That comes out to about
  20
      $1.8.
  21
                MS. ELBAZ: Yes.
  22
                THE COURT: All right. So I will make it $1.8.
  23
      That is fine.
  24
                MS. ELBAZ: Can I secure an asset that I have a
  25
      mortgage on, Your Honor?
```

```
THE COURT: I don't really care about any of that because if she disappears the Government is just going to take whatever you have got and they can sort that out later. I could care less about the net or whatever.
```

If she disappears, the Government is going to take your property, and then you can fight with the Department of Justice about how much you owe and how much you don't owe, and you will never see any money because they will take the money to make up the \$1.8 million that you owe the Government. So I am not really interested in what your equity is in the property or not. It is not really important for my discussions now.

MS. ELBAZ: I understand, Your Honor. I am just asking physically if I will be able to secure the property for any amount larger than what I owe on it because I have a mortgage.

THE COURT: You are posting the property that has \$1.2 million.

MS. ELBAZ: Yes, but if releasing her is dependent on me being able to go to San Francisco and get the security, I am just wondering if I will be able to get the security that is more than what I can secure there.

THE COURT: You don't have to do anything. All you have to do is I am going to sign a bunch of orders, and you are going to sign them too, and one of these orders is going

```
to direct you to file one of these pieces of paper among the land records for where you are.
```

So you don't have to go -- there is no action by you other than filing something in the land records and giving me proof that you did to pretrial.

MS. ELBAZ: Thank you.

THE COURT: But you don't have to like go try to get real hard currency to put in an escrow or anything like that. This is just in the event -- hopefully it never occurs but it is in the event that she fails to appear. Otherwise, if everything goes fine and the case gets resolved however it gets resolved, then the lawyer files a motion to me saying, hey, the case is over. Please release the third-party custodian.

And I sign an order that you can take to the land records where you live and take this cloud of the title. So all I am doing now is like --- and clouding your titles. That is all I am doing.

MS. ELBAZ: I understand. I just wanted to know if it is physical to put a lien on the house on more than my --

THE COURT: That is a good point. All right, ma'am, you are to surrender any passport, which has been done, immediately to the Clerk's Office. ---, passport or travel documents. Your travel is restricted to the district, the Northern District of California and the District of Maryland,

1 or I guess Washington, DC, if you come visit your attorney.

Your Office, Mr. Lopez, is in DC?

MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, my office is in DC but I am hoping you can put as part of these conditions that she can visit Orrick's San Francisco office so that way we can be videoconferencing.

THE COURT: She can go anywhere in the Northern -- we will get to that in a second.

Ma'am, you are to avoid all contact, directly or indirectly, with any person who is or may become a victim or a potential witness in the investigation or prosecution of this case, including but not limited to any witnesses and co-Defendants.

Government, do you wish to provide a list to

Mr. Lopez of people she should not have contact with or not?

MR. KHARDORI: Not at this time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, all right. Ma'am please listen very carefully to this. There are a lot of people in pretrial detention because they violate this condition. I am not sure how smart you are or how not smart you are. It is obviously who knows but if you reach out to anybody associated with this case, any co-workers, any witnesses, any co-Defendants, anybody to talk about this case, or figure out who is doing what, who is talking to who, what has happened to whom, that is an expressed violation of my release conditions.

```
1
              If you have questions, you ask your lawyer. If you
    reach out by any means whatsoever, it is a violation of these
3
    release conditions. Do you understand that?
4
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
              THE COURT: Ma'am, you must refrain from possessing
5
    a firearm, destructive device or other dangerous weapon.
6
7
    Refrain from any excessive use of alcohol. I am directing
8
    that you submit to a location monitoring program. You are
9
    restricted to the residence of the third-party custodian
    except for medical purposes, court appearances, attorney
10
11
    visits or other activities specifically approved by pretrial
12
    in advance.
13
              Now, here comes -- this will be like another
14
    30-minute discussion, which I really don't feel like having
15
    but is this a case, Government or pretrial, where we should
    restrict her access to the Internet given the nature of the
16
17
    charges?
18
              MR. KHARDORI: Yes, certainly.
19
              THE COURT: Mr. Lopez, any comment on that?
20
              MR. LOPEZ: I don't think that is at all necessary.
21
    The Government clearly has an ongoing investigation. They are
22
    clearly going to know if she has violated the Court's order of
23
    contacting others and so on.
24
              I don't think that is a condition that -- first of
25
    all, I don't think they met the danger prong. Second, it
```

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Case 8:17-mj-02534-TJS Document 21 Filed 10/16/17 Page 76 of 86
    definitely doesn't go to -- I don't think it goes to risk of
1
    flight either. Third, practically if the Court were to go
3
    that way I think it is, tell her not to do it, her aunt has a
4
    tech start-up company. She can't not have Internet in that
5
    house. Maybe in the room --
6
              THE COURT: This happens all the time. I mean, the
7
    aunt -- I mean, I am not going to punish the third-party
8
    custodian's use of the Internet but they can password protect
9
    things and protect the devices from her use. That happens all
10
    the time.
11
              MR. LOPEZ: I don't think that is necessary and
12
    frankly it would really impinge upon my ability to communicate
13
    with her as well. We are going to be passing documents back
```

and forth. We are going to be doing things. I would much rather her be able to do those things and use the Internet in that regard.

She also -- yes, I just don't think that the facts of this case warrant limiting. I don't think it is realistic to think that she is --

THE COURT: The allegation is that she has used the Internet and used e-mails to perpetrate a fraud. How is that not relevant?

MR. LOPEZ: As part of a whole thing that they are saying happened in Israel --

THE COURT: Forget about that. Yes, just answer my

```
question though. Just answer my question. The allegation is that she has used the Internet under different names to perpetuate bank fraud or whatever the allegation is here, and that she has used the Internet as one of the vehicles upon which the Government alleges she committed federal crimes.
```

And my question -- really simple. You said no, and that is fine. That what confidence do I have, if I don't put this restriction on, that she will continue to use the Internet to either obstruct justice, talk to co-Defendants, talk to witnesses, try to do whatever because that is the MO that is contained in the criminal complaint in the affidavit?

That this Defendant, despite whatever role she may or may not have, whatever level of supervision she may or may not have, it is pretty clear she has used the Internet to communicate with quote, unquote investors, and has used other names and also has communicated with other employees at her place of employment about how to do their business.

MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, I just don't. E-mail is the way people function today. That fact alone doesn't carry the same weight it does maybe 10 years ago. I would say it is not realistic to think that she is a danger of committing ongoing fraud by having access to the Internet.

So I am just -- I am just wondering.

MR. KHARDORI: Your Honor, if I could just briefly -- you are exactly right. This is an Internet fraud.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Already we are chipping away at the conditions here. 10, 20
minutes ago, it was, oh, she can go to the videoconferencing
at my office in San Francisco. Now it is I have to be able to
e-mail with her.
          This case involves alias e-mails, false e-mail
addresses so we have no assurance that the Government can
```

necessarily even determine what is occurring while she is accessing the Internet.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. McCabe, what are your -do you have any thoughts on this one condition given the nature and circumstances of everything that you have just sat through for the last hour?

MS. McCABE: Your Honor, I believe it is an appropriate condition. If I may also --

THE COURT: Did you say is?

MS. McCABE: I believe it is an appropriate condition. It would have been a condition I would have recommended given an opportunity.

Additionally, Your Honor. We do have a concern. We are unsure. The Defendant didn't report that she is no longer employed at the present time so we just want to make sure that is the case, that while she is here in the US, that she is not going to be working.

THE COURT: No, my intention is this. It is very simple. I am moving a jail cell from the District of Maryland

```
to a 1633 Burrows Street, and she will be locked down in that residence 24/7, not allowed to go outside, not allowed to sit on the stoop, not allowed to take the trash out, not allowed to go have a cigarette outside or whatever.
```

She will be able to leave when pretrial says it is okay to leave, and those will be for medical purposes, court appearances, attorney visits or any other matters approved in advance by pretrial.

Other than that, she is locked in her aunt's house 24/7. Period, end of discussion. Then that way I have confidence that she won't be a flight risk, and that is my intention.

So she won't be having a job somewhere. And she doesn't even have -- I mean, if we are going to be stickler on ICE and immigration, she doesn't even have the ability to even lawfully work here in the United States.

And if she wants to commit future crimes by this company, then that is on her.

MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, just on the Internet piece, I may have something.

THE COURT: Why does she need to use the Internet in the first place?

MR. LOPEZ: I will tell you why. I will tell you the reason is that basically to be able to Skype her mom and Skype her dad or Facetime her mom or dad. You need an

Internet connection to do that.

THE COURT: Mr. Lopez, I am old but I am not that old. Go ahead. I understand about Facetime and Skype. Thank you for the technological tutor but I know what that means. I must be looking really old lately.

I am not going to put that as a condition now but ma'am, be cognizant of the fact -- and the reason, a part of me kind of agrees with Ms. McCabe that I think it is appropriate.

But if you are foolish enough to -- I am sure they will be doing what they do, the Government, and if you are foolish enough to engage in misuse of the Internet to facilitate or try to cover up or obstruct or interfere or impede justice in the prosecution or any other case that is related, and if you try to tamper or try to retaliate against people or try to intimidate people and you use the Internet to do that, then shame on you, and you will be in jail. It is that simple.

Ma'am, you may not open any new lines of credit of any kind without prior pretrial approval. You are not to engage in the binary option business whatsoever.

The third-party custodian must personally accompany the Defendant to all court appearances and all meetings with counsel, and if they happen in DC fine. If it happens in San Francisco, third-party custodian also must attend that as

```
Case 8:17-mj-02534-TJS Document 21 Filed 10/16/17 Page 81 of 86
lcj
   1
      well. And any such meetings must be approved, or travel must
      be approved in advance by pretrial obviously under the
   3
      conditions.
   4
                The Defendant will stay in custody of the marshal
      until such time as pretrial has evidence that the bond has
  5
  6
      been posted pursuant to these release conditions.
   7
                MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, can I just make it a little
  8
      bit more specific on the attorney piece in San Francisco
  9
      because I would like her to be able to go to our offices at
  10
      405 Howard Street.
  11
                THE COURT: Yes, I know. Orrick has a San Francisco
  12
      office.
               She has to get approval by pretrial that --
  13
                MR. LOPEZ: That is fine but the aunt doesn't have
  14
      to --
  15
                THE COURT: The aunt has to go.
                MR. LOPEZ: To drive her there?
  16
  17
                THE COURT: Yes.
  18
                MR. LOPEZ: Now can she be -- once she gets there,
  19
      can she --
  20
  21
      have a really nice lobby there with like cappuccino machines
  22
```

THE COURT: She can sit in the lobby. I bet you guy and stuff like that. And she can sit in the lobby while your client is Skyping with you on the Orrick Intranet. But my purpose of this is when Ms. Elbaz is out in the community, that she is accompanied by her aunt.

23

24

25

```
MR. LOPEZ: I get that. My question is whether an attorney in our office could then -- we are barred, we are under ethical obligations.
```

THE COURT: I know. I bet you guys are great lawyers. I am sure you are but I am not going to -- no, no.

MR. LOPEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The reality is, like everything else, if we start moving down the road and she seems to be in compliance and we can revisit if pretrial says that, you know, we can tweak some of these -- that they believe in their professional judgment, given what is going on, that we can tweak some of these conditions of release, then I will be amenable to considering it.

I am not going to guarantee I am going to do it but despite everything that has been said, I consider her to be a flight risk. Is it enough of a flight risk to detain her?

That is a tough call for me. And it is really close. It is really a close call for me.

But I am giving her the benefit of the doubt given your filibustering here that I am going to impose what I consider to be the least restrictive conditions, and these are them because the next step is detention. There is no intermediate step. This is as good as it is going to get for her.

And as we move down the road, one or two things are

lcj |

```
1
    going to happen. She is going to violate them. And I am
    going to issue an arrest warrant if the Government asks me to.
3
    And I am going to put her in custody in San Francisco and she
4
    can get on the marshal van or plane and be brought here to
    Maryland and we will figure out what to do with her.
5
              My hope is that she abides by these release
6
7
    conditions to the letter and we don't have any problems moving
8
    forward.
9
              MR. LOPEZ: I will take the hint, Your Honor, and
10
    pipe down.
11
              THE COURT: You don't have to pipe down. You are
12
    being a zealous advocate for your client. I got it.
13
              Ms. McCabe, any other conditions other than what I
14
    said I am not going to do? Any other conditions that pretrial
15
    believes appropriate?
16
              MS. McCABE: No, Your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: All right, I am going to have to go back
    and write these up really quick. In fact, Brandon, just give
18
19
    me another conditions release form.
20
         (Pause)
21
              MR. LOPEZ: Your Honor, I am sorry to interrupt
22
         The surety has another question and I want to at least
23
    make sure I ask even though I think I answered it for her.
24
              THE COURT: All right, what is your question?
```

MR. LOPEZ: She is a bit confused as to whether she

25

has to fly back to California, file papers, and then fly back here before she can do it or is there some way to commit to have it done in 24 hours.

THE COURT: Doesn't Orrick have an office in San Francisco?

MR. LOPEZ: We do.

THE COURT: Okay. So, I mean, she is going to be signing documents that are going to be killing a lot of trees. That she is going to be signing a document that has to be recorded among the land records for whatever county or however they do land records out in California, I don't know how they do them.

She needs to file my order both for Eugenia Avenue and Burrows among the land records evidencing the Government's interest in the collateral for property. If Orrick's San Francisco office can do that, then she doesn't have to fly to California to get it done. It can all be done by -- I think you might have to overnight the order because they might require an original. I don't know how all that works but she can stay here until all that is done.

Otherwise, yes, counsel, she is going to have to fly back to California, do it, and then fly back here to accompany her niece back to San Francisco. But Orrick has a San Francisco office. And maybe you guys can work with her to get my order secured among the land records without having her

```
Case 8:17-mj-02534-TJS Document 21 Filed 10/16/17 Page 85 of 86
lcj
                                                                         85
      travel back and forth, and if that can happen, that is fine
   1
   2
       too.
                 MR. LOPEZ: Okay, Your Honor, I got the picture.
   3
   4
                 THE COURT: All right.
            (Whereupon, at 1:02 p.m., the hearing was concluded.)
   5
   6
   7
   8
   9
  10
  11
  12
  13
  14
  15
  16
  17
  18
  19
  20
  21
  22
  23
```


I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the duplicated electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Laura C. Jackson 10/13/2017
Laura C. Jackson Date

Transcriber